

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/789,603	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GERY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dan Washburn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Pending

 (1) Dan Washburn.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) D. Kent Stier.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 10 November 2006
**Time:** 3:30 pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**

none

**Claims discussed:**

Claims 1,2, 4-8 and 14-19

**Prior art documents discussed:**

none

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Washburn called Attorney Stier regarding the identical scope of claims 1, 2, and 4-8 when compared against claims 14-19. Examiner Washburn also proposed amending some unclear language in claim 1. Attorney Stier agreed that claims 1, 2, and 4-8 were substantially identical in scope to claims 14-19 and proposed cancelling claim 2 in order to remedy the problem. Attorney Stier also agreed to amending claim 1 to clarify the language used.